

2011/49



Does the seller of a house facing a large number of buyers always decrease its price when its first offer is rejected?

Jean J. Gabszewicz, Tanguy van Ypersele
and Skerdilajda Zana

A stylized blue arc graphic that starts above the word 'CORE' and curves downwards and to the right, ending below the word.

CORE

DISCUSSION PAPER

Center for Operations Research
and Econometrics

Voie du Roman Pays, 34
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve
Belgium

<http://www.uclouvain.be/core>

CORE DISCUSSION PAPER
2011/49

**Does the seller of a house facing a large number of buyers always
decrease its price when its first offer is rejected?**

Jean J. GABSZEWICZ¹, Tanguy VAN YPERSELE²
and Skerdilajda ZANAJ³

September 2011

Abstract

This paper identifies the optimal two-period price sequence in the attempt for selling a good, with take-it-or-leave-it offers, when the seller faces ambiguity about the buyers' willingness to pay. If the first round fails, the seller updates its beliefs on the state of the market in accordance with Bayes rule and quotes a second and final price. We show that the optimal sequence of prices can be increasing. Furthermore, we describe the optimal sequence of prices with a myopic seller who does not update his beliefs in the second period. In this case, the optimal price sequence is always decreasing.

Keywords: ambiguity, sequential bilateral trade, Bayesian vs myopic behaviour.

JEL Classification: D8, D82, D89

¹ Université catholique de Louvain, CORE, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

E-mail: jean.gabszewicz@uclouvain.be. This author is also member of ECORE, the association between CORE and ECARES.

² GREQAM, Marseille, France. E-mail: tanguy.vy@univmed.fr

³ University of Luxembourg, CREA. E-mail: skerdilajda.zanaj@uni.lu

This paper presents research results of the Belgian Program on Interuniversity Poles of Attraction initiated by the Belgian State, Prime Minister's Office, Science Policy Programming. The scientific responsibility is assumed by the authors.

1 Introduction

Consider the owner of a house, or of any indivisible object, who is willing to sell it while facing a large number of potential buyers. This is a situation often encountered in the real estate market when the seller does not use an auction mechanism or any other available device, but simply sets and advertises a price, then waiting for a buyer whose reservation price exceeds the price. In this situation, the seller is like a monopolist since, not only he/she is the only owner of the house, but the buyers' side he/she faces is atomistic. Thus, the potential buyers are like price taking agents in a monopoly market. All of those who are potential candidates to buy the house perfectly know that, if the price set by the seller exceeds their reservation price, the seller can always wait enough time to be sure to find another potential buyer with a reservation price larger or equal to their own reservation price. It is a good reason to accept the price as given. Of course, there is a penalty incurred by the seller while waiting for another potential buyer: This penalty takes the form of the discount rate to be applied to the amount of the sale, due to the time delay in obtaining it. This delay can be *a priori* very long, especially when the seller does not know with certainty the explicit value of the reservation prices existing in the large population of potential buyers, and when these potential buyers arrive at random to possibly make the deal. In several circumstances, the seller cannot wait for ever before finding a buyer whose reservation price exceeds the price. For instance, when the seller of the house needs the amount of the sale in order to buy another one, its impatience constrains him to sell the good in a rather short delay.

In this note, we propose a formal model capturing the essential ingredients of the above description, and we analyse the optimal strategies for selling the house, when the seller is uncertain about the distribution of the buyers' willingness to pay¹. First we assume that the seller, with one indivisible object to sell, has only two periods to succeed to sell the house (for instance for the reason given above: the seller of the house needs the amount of money resulting from the sale in order to buy another one).² Buyers are assumed to arrive randomly, one at a time. The seller sets a price for the object, while the buyer can either accept or reject the offer (take-it-or-leave-it offer). If the offer is accepted, then the object is transferred at the announced price; otherwise, the process continues for a next period, and stops afterwards. The seller can set another price in the second period. We are interested in the optimal price sequence in this repeated retrial of selling an object, which appears as typical in the housing market³. Then, we examine how a myopic seller,

¹Uncertainty about the distribution of an event is often referred to as *ambiguity*, distinguishing between known (the probability and payoff are precise) and unknown (ambiguity in the probability and/or payoff) uncertainty.

²This is assumed to be private information available to the seller but not to the potential buyers.

³Because our attention is focused in the housing market we do not assume an auction mechanism as

who does not update his/her *a priori* beliefs, would select the optimal price sequence. One could think that a first rejection should induce the seller of the house to increase the chances to sell it by reducing the price in the second trial. Surprisingly, we show that, even if this is always the case when the seller is myopic, the price of the house can well increase when the seller updates his beliefs in a Bayesian way. To do so, we first consider a selling process in which a sophisticated seller learns from a first rejection to buy, and updates *à la Bayes* his/her beliefs concerning the distribution of the willingness to pay over the buyers' population. Our main motivation is to answer the following question: *does a rational seller always decrease its price in the second period?* Surprisingly we show that, in several cases, a Bayesian seller is willing to increase its price at the second period.

Most of the literature related to the above problem is formulated assuming the context of bilateral trade with one seller and one buyer bargaining about the exchange price. This context is very different from the one adopted here and resorts to game theory as the natural analytical instrument to develop models capturing this bilateral situation (see Rubinstein (1982), Binmore (1980), Chatterjee and Samuelson (1980), Crawford (1981), Sobel and Takahashi (1981) and Fudenberg and Tirole (1983)). In particular, Fudenberg and Tirole (1983) build a bilateral sequential bargaining game and use the concept of perfect Bayesian equilibrium. These authors focus on issues of commitment and information transfer in a game where both the seller and the buyer update their beliefs about their opponents in accordance with Bayes rule. In this paper, Fudenberg and Tirole (1983) do also obtain the surprising result of prices increasing over time but such a result is due to the combination of information transfer and the lack of precommitment embodied in the perfectness of the definition of the equilibria. Even if our context is very different, we have identified a similar property, in a much simpler setup.

2 The model

Consider a unit of an indivisible good, such as a house. The owner of the good who wants to sell it receives each period the visit of a potential buyer, whose reservation price is equal to λ , a random variable.

Assume that the seller faces ambiguity concerning the state of the market. More specifically, the seller does not know whether the willingness to pay λ of buyers is distributed uniformly over the distribution $[0, \underline{\lambda}]$, the *narrow range distribution*, or over the distribution $[0, \bar{\lambda}]$, the *wide range distribution*, with $\bar{\lambda} > \underline{\lambda}$. Thus, the range of reservation prices either includes only rather low values for the object or, on the contrary, extends to include also higher values. Define $\bar{F}(\lambda)$ the cumulative function of the first distribution

in Myerson (1981) who describe a mechanism typical of art objects auctions.

and $\underline{F}(\lambda)$ the cumulative function of the second:

$$\bar{F}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} & \text{for } \lambda < \bar{\lambda} \\ 1 & \text{for } \lambda > \bar{\lambda} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{F}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\underline{\lambda}} & \text{for } \lambda < \underline{\lambda} \\ 1 & \text{for } \lambda > \underline{\lambda}. \end{cases}$$

Before the transaction takes place, the seller believes that, with probability π_0 the wide range distribution is the good one. Then, the probability that a visitor has a willingness to pay smaller than λ is given by

$$H_0(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \pi_0 \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} + (1 - \pi_0) \frac{\lambda}{\underline{\lambda}} & \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \underline{\lambda} \\ \pi_0 \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} + (1 - \pi_0) & \text{for } \underline{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda} \\ 1 & \text{for } \bar{\lambda} < \lambda. \end{cases}$$

In the following we shall restrict the analysis to the case when $\pi_0 \in [0, \frac{1}{4}] \cup [\frac{1}{2}, 1]^4$.

Assume that the seller sets in period zero a price p_0 to his/her first visitor, and that the transaction fails. Then, clearly, the willingness to buy of the visitor is smaller than p_0 . Hence, if the price announced is p_0 , the transaction fails with probability $H_0(p_0)$. In case of failure to sell in the first round, the seller learns from this event and can update his/her prior on probability π_0 according to the following rule:

$$\pi_1(p_0) = P(\bar{\lambda} | \lambda < p_0) = \frac{P(\lambda < p_0 | \bar{\lambda})\pi_0}{P(\lambda < p_0 | \bar{\lambda})\pi_0 + P(\lambda < p_0 | \underline{\lambda})(1 - \pi_0)} = \bar{F}(p_0) \frac{\pi_0}{H_0(p_0)}.$$

It is therefore necessary to distinguish two cases: (a) the price announced p_0 is smaller than the highest value of willingness to pay in narrow range distribution i.e. $\underline{\lambda}$; (b) the price announced p_0 is higher than $\underline{\lambda}$ ⁵.

Case a $p_0 < \underline{\lambda}$. It follows that the updated probability $\pi_1^a(p_0)$ is given by

$$\pi_1^a(p_0) = \frac{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0}{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}. \quad (1)$$

Case b $p_0 \geq \underline{\lambda}$. Then, the updated probability $\pi_1^b(p_0)$ is given by

$$\pi_1^b(p_0) = \frac{p_0\pi_0}{p_0\pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}. \quad (2)$$

The cumulative distribution of the first period $H_1(\lambda)$ is as $H_0(\lambda)$ but now the probability that the wide range distribution is the good one is π_1 , with $\pi_1 = \pi_1^a$ if $p_0 < \underline{\lambda}$ and $\pi_1 = \pi_1^b$ if $p_0 \geq \underline{\lambda}$.

⁴This condition simplifies considerably the analysis. However, the optimal choice could easily be obtained without it.

⁵Notice that a rejection to buy when $p_0 > \underline{\lambda}$, does not provide full information on the distribution of buyer because the two distributions overlap.

Our main concern consists in comparing the price quoted by the seller before the possible rejection of his/her first proposal and the price quoted *ex-post*, when rejection has taken place and the resulting information is taken into account *via* the Bayesian revision of the probability related to the willingness to pay distribution. In particular, we want to examine whether Bayesian revision always implies a decrease in the optimal price between period 0 and period 1, as one would expect a priori; or, on the contrary, whether an increasing optimal sequence could occur. To this end, we fully develop the payoff maximization solution for all admissible values of the parameters and we use this analysis to explore the properties of the optimal price sequence. Afterwards, we compare these properties with those arising in the case of a myopic seller.

The optimization problem is solved backwards assuming that the price p_0 has been selected in period zero.

2.1 Payoff maximisation in period one

Let the price p_0 be announced in period one. Then, the revision of the guess on the distribution of buyers yields π_1 as given by (1) or (2), which defines $H_1(p_1)$. In the second period, the seller maximizes its payoff $\Pi_1(p_1) = p_1(1 - H_1(p_1))$. Under the condition $\frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} > 1 - \frac{1}{2\pi_1}$, $p_1^* < \underline{\lambda}$, the candidate optimal price p_1^* is

$$p_1^*(\pi_1) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}}{\underline{\lambda}\pi_1 + \bar{\lambda}(1 - \pi_1)}. \quad (3)$$

The corresponding payoff is

$$\Pi_1(\pi_1) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}}{\underline{\lambda}\pi_1 + \bar{\lambda}(1 - \pi_1)}.$$

When $\frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} < \frac{1}{2}$, then, $p_1^{**} > \underline{\lambda}$. Hence, the candidate optimal price p_1^{**} is

$$p_1^{**}(\pi_1) = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}, \quad (4)$$

with corresponding payoff

$$\Pi_1(\pi_1) = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{4}\pi_1.$$

It is possible to check that $\Pi_1(p_1^{**}(\pi_1)) > \Pi_1(p_1^*(\pi_1))$ iff $\frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} < \frac{\pi_1}{1+\pi_1}$. Thus, provided that the inequality $\frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} < \frac{\pi_1}{1+\pi_1}$ holds⁶, the seller announces in the second trial to sell the house, a price equal to $p_1^{**}(\pi_1) = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}$. Otherwise the optimal price in the second trial is given by $p_1^*(\pi_1)$.

Depending on the price level p_0 set in the first period, the revision of the prior differs. Therefore, we have two cases.

⁶Notice that $\frac{\pi_1}{1+\pi_1} \in]1 - \frac{1}{2\pi_1}, \frac{1}{2}[$.

Case a $p_0 < \underline{\lambda}$, Substituting the expression of $\pi_1^a(p_0)$ in the ratio $\frac{\pi_1}{1+\pi_1}$, we obtain

$$\pi_1 = \frac{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0}{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}.$$

Note that in this case the probability π_1 is always smaller than π_0 . Hence, after a rejection of a price that is smaller than $\underline{\lambda}$, the seller decreases the probability with which he believes that the good distribution has as support the interval $[0, \bar{\lambda}]$.

Case b $p_0 > \underline{\lambda}$, Substituting π_1 in (4) we get

$$\pi_1 = \frac{p_0\pi_0}{p_0\pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}.$$

where similarly to above π_1 is always smaller than π_0 . Hence, regardless how small is the price quoted in period zero, a rejection decreases the probability that the true distribution is the wide range one. It is not so surprising that rejection in period 0, puts a downward pressure in the belief of the seller about the domain of buyers' preferences for the object on sale.

Summarizing the two cases

Lemma *If $p_0 < \underline{\lambda}$, the optimal price sequence in the second period is given by $p_{1a}^{**} = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}$ for all $\frac{\underline{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} \in [0, \frac{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0}{2\underline{\lambda}\pi_0 + (1-\pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}]$ and $p_{1a}^* = \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}}{2} \frac{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0 + \bar{\lambda}(1-\pi_0)}{\underline{\lambda}^2\pi_0 + \bar{\lambda}^2(1-\pi_0)}$ otherwise. If $p_0 > \underline{\lambda}$, the equilibrium price $p_{1b}^{**} = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}$ for all $\frac{\underline{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} \in [0, \frac{p_0\pi_0}{2p_0\pi_0 + (1-\pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}]$ and $p_{1b}^* = \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}}{2} \frac{p_0\pi_0 + \bar{\lambda}(1-\pi_0)}{p_0\underline{\lambda}\pi_0 + \bar{\lambda}^2(1-\pi_0)}$ otherwise.*

2.2 Payoff maximization in period zero

The payoff in the first period writes as

$$\Pi_0 = (1 - H_0(p_0))p_0 + H_0(p_0)\Pi_1(p_0)$$

Solving the first order conditions, the candidate payoff maximizing prices are given by⁷

$$p_0^* = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}(1 + \frac{\pi_0}{4})}{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}$$

if $\pi_0 < 1/4$ for any $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\underline{\lambda}}$; if $\pi_0 > 1/2$ for $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\underline{\lambda}} < \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0 - 4}$. The candidate price is

$$p_0^{**} = \frac{5}{8}\bar{\lambda}$$

if $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\underline{\lambda}} > \frac{8}{5}$.

⁷Notice that $\frac{8}{5} < \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0 - 4}$ when $\pi_0 > 1/2$.

Hence, provided that $\pi_0 < 1/4$, we have to compare the payoffs when $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} > \frac{8}{5}$. Instead, if $\pi_0 > 1/2$, we have to compare the payoffs when $\frac{8}{5} < \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} < \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0-4}$. The payoff $\Pi_0(p_0^*)$ and $\Pi_0(p_0^{**})$ writes as

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_0(p_0^*) = (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\pi_0}{8})^2 \frac{\bar{\lambda}\lambda}{\lambda\pi_0 + (1-\pi_0)\bar{\lambda}} \\ \Pi_0(p_0^{**}) = (\frac{5}{8})^2 \bar{\lambda}\pi_0 \end{cases}$$

It is possible to show that $\Pi_0(p_0^*) > \Pi_0(p_0^{**})$ iff $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} > \frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0}$. We can also easily show that $\frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0} < \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0-4}$ when $\pi_0 > 1/2$ and $\frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0} > \frac{8}{5}$ for all π_0 . Hence, we can summarize the optimal sequence of prices as follows:

Lemma *If $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} \in \left[\frac{8}{5}, \frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0}\right]$, the optimal price sequence is $\left\{p_0^* = \frac{5}{8}\bar{\lambda}; p_1^* = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right\}$. The same optimal sequence applies in the set $[\frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0-4}, \infty[$ if $\pi_0 > \frac{1}{2}$. In all other cases, the optimal price sequence is $\left\{p_0^* = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\lambda(1+\frac{\pi_0}{4})}{\lambda\pi_0 + (1-\pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}; p_1^* = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right\}$.*

Now we are equipped with the needed information to study the behavior of prices in the optimal sequence, in particular whether this optimal sequence could be increasing. Using the above Lemma 2 to compare prices of the first period with prices of the second period we observe that the optimal sequence of pricing $\left\{p_0^* = \frac{5}{8}\bar{\lambda}; p_1^* = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right\}$ is always decreasing. Nevertheless, comparison of prices in the sequence $\left\{p_0^* = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\lambda(1+\frac{\pi_0}{4})}{\lambda\pi_0 + (1-\pi_0)\bar{\lambda}}; p_1^* = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right\}$ reveals the following property :

Proposition 1 *Assume a Bayesian seller. When $\pi_0 < \frac{1}{4}$, the price set by the seller increases from period zero to period one if $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} \in [\frac{(4-3\pi_0)}{4(1-\pi_0)}, \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0-4}]$. When $\pi_0 > \frac{1}{2}$ then the optimal price sequence is increasing if $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} > \frac{(4-3\pi_0)}{4(1-\pi_0)}$.*

Proof. We compare $p_0^* = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\lambda}{\lambda\pi_0 + (1-\pi_0)\bar{\lambda}} (1 + \frac{\pi_0}{4})$ and $p_1^* = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}$, which can be an optimal sequence of prices in the set $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} \in \left[\frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0}, \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0-4}\right]$ when $\pi_0 > \frac{1}{2}$ and they are defined in the set $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} \in \left(\frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0}, +\infty\right[$ when $\pi_0 < \frac{1}{4}$. Such prices satisfy $p_0^* < p_1^*$ if $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} > \frac{(4-3\pi_0)}{4(1-\pi_0)}$. This inequality can be satisfied for $\pi_0 > \frac{1}{2}$ or $\pi_0 < \frac{1}{4}$ because $\left[\frac{(4-3\pi_0)}{4(1-\pi_0)}, \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0-4}\right] \cap \left[\frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0}, \frac{8\pi_0}{9\pi_0-4}\right] \neq \emptyset$ and $\frac{(4-3\pi_0)}{4(1-\pi_0)} < \frac{8}{25} \frac{2+3\pi_0}{\pi_0}$. A numerical illustration corresponding to the case π_0 is small is the following. Let $\pi_0 = 0.2$, $\bar{\lambda} = 505$, and $\lambda = 100$. Then, $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} = 5.05 \notin \left[\frac{8}{5}; 4.16\right]$, and $p_0^* = 62.529$ while $p_1^* = 252.5$. Another example corresponding to the case where $\pi_0 > \frac{1}{2}$ is $\pi_0 = 0.55$, $\bar{\lambda} = 135$ and $\lambda = 100$. In this case, $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} = 1.35 \notin \left[\frac{8}{5}; 2.12\right] \cup [4.63, \infty[$ while $p_0^* = 66.334$ and $p_1^* = 67.5$. Q.E.D. ■

The increase in the price announced in the second trial is the result of different forces. Consider first the situation where the probability assigned to the wide range distribution

is low, i.e. $\pi_0 < \frac{1}{4}$. Were the difference between the two distributions not large, the seller would choose to lower the price in the second trial since, as shown above, π_1 is smaller than π_0 , which reinforces the weight of the narrow range distribution in the relative likelihood between the two events. But the difference between the two distributions can be very large. Accordingly, this difference can be so large that it can countervail the weak probability that the wide range distribution is the good one. As a consequence, it can induce the seller to increase the price, in spite of the low probability assigned to the wide range distribution, to take advantage of a possible high-willingness to pay buyer in the second period.

Now consider the case when π_0 is not very different, but larger, than $\frac{1}{2}$. Then, the fact that both distributions are likely the same, a high value of π_1 would normally lead the seller to believe that the wide range distribution is the true one. Therefore, the optimal sequence can be increasing even when the two distributions are quite similar.

3 Optimal prices with a myopic seller

The forces defining the optimal choice of prices are dictated by the fact that the seller anticipates in period 0 what can happen in period 1. It is therefore interesting to compare the choice of a Bayesian seller with that of a myopic one who does not exploit the information resulting from the first trial.

3.1 Payoff maximization in the second period

Consider that the price p_0 is set in period 0 and that *no revision* is made concerning the distribution of buyers.

In the second period, the seller maximizes its payoff $\Pi_1(p_1)$ given by

$$\Pi_1(p_1) = p_1(1 - H_0(p_1))$$

where $H_1(p_1)$ is the same as $H_0(p_0)$.

$$H_0(\lambda) = H_1(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \pi_0 \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} + (1 - \pi_0) \frac{\lambda}{\underline{\lambda}} & \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \underline{\lambda} \\ \pi_0 \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} + (1 - \pi_0) & \text{for } \underline{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda} \\ 1 & \text{for } \bar{\lambda} < \lambda \end{cases}$$

Hence the price selected in the second period is given by

$$p_1^* = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\lambda} \underline{\lambda}}{\underline{\lambda} \pi_0 + \bar{\lambda} (1 - \pi_0)}, \quad (5)$$

which is the optimal price if the payoff is decreasing in $p_1 = \underline{\lambda}$, $1 - 2\underline{\lambda}(\frac{\pi_0}{\underline{\lambda}} + \frac{1-\pi_0}{\underline{\lambda}}) < 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\underline{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} > 1 - \frac{1}{2\pi_0}$. The corresponding payoff is

$$\Pi_1(p_1^*) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}}{\underline{\lambda}\pi_0 + \bar{\lambda}(1 - \pi_0)}$$

If the payoff is increasing in p_1 , $p_1 = \underline{\lambda}$, i.e. $\frac{\underline{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} < \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$p_1^{**} = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2} \quad (6)$$

is the optimal price, with corresponding payoff

$$\Pi_1(p_1^{**}) = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{4} \pi_0.$$

It is easy to verify that $\Pi_1(p_1^*) \geq \Pi_1(p_1^{**})$ iff $\frac{\underline{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} \leq \frac{\pi_0}{1+\pi_0}$.

3.2 Payoff Maximization in the first period

The payoff in the first period writes as

$$\Pi_0 = (1 - H_0(p_0))p_0 + H_0(p_0)\Pi_1(p_1).$$

where the expression of $\Pi_1(p_1)$ shall be substituted either with $\Pi_1(p_1^*)$ or with $\Pi_1(p_1^{**})$ according as $\frac{\underline{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} \leq \frac{\pi_0}{1+\pi_0}$. The solution of first order conditions yields the price in period 1 as

$$p_0^* = \begin{cases} \frac{5}{8} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}(1-\pi_0) + \underline{\lambda}\pi_0} & \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \underline{\lambda} \\ \frac{1}{8} \frac{\bar{\lambda}\underline{\lambda}(4\bar{\lambda} - 4\lambda\pi_0 + 5\underline{\lambda}\pi_0)}{(\bar{\lambda}(\pi_0 - 1) - \underline{\lambda}\pi_0)^2} & \text{for } \underline{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Direct comparison of prices in the candidate optimal sequences of prices reveals that

Proposition 2 *Assume a myopic seller. The price of the house in the second period always decreases.*

Proof. We compare the expression of p_0^* in (7) with the expressions (5) and (6) which shows that the price quoted in the second period is always small than the price in the first period. ■

This could explain why most sellers probably do decrease prices when they face a rejection at their first trial. Of course, other explanations concur to reinforce this phenomenon, like the existence of a discount rate and/or the belief that a lower price is a piece of information that would be spread fastly among the potential buyers.

4 Conclusion

This note tackles a problem which has fascinated economists since a long period of time. It can be formulated in many contexts, differing by their assumptions and the difficulties of its treatment. In some sense we have chosen the simplest one since we have assumed that (i) one side of the market consists of a single agent behaving rationally, while the other one consist of a continuum of agents who behave myopically; (ii) only one buyer arrives at a time; and (iii) there are only two periods where the seller can meet a potential buyer. We feel that these assumptions might correspond to several situations encountered in the housing markets. Probably the most awkward among these assumptions is the third one. Generalizing our approach to an extended set-up accepting *a priori* an arbitrary number of periods with the existence of a discounting rate constitutes a natural field for further research.

References

- [1] BINMORE, K. (1980), "Nash Bargaining Theory: II" (London School of Economics I.C.E.R.D.).
- [2] CHATT'ERJEE, K. and SAMUELSON, W. (1980), "The Simple Economics of Bargaining" (mimeo, Pennsylvania State University).
- [3] CRAWFORD, V. (1981), "A Theory of Disagreement in Bargaining", *Econometrica*, 50, 607-638.
- [4] FUDENBERG, D. and TIROLE J. : "Sequential Bargaining with Incomplete Information", *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 221-247
- [5] MYERSON, R. B.: "Optimal Auction Design," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 6(1981), 58-73.
- [6] RUBINSTEIN, A. (1982), "Perfect Equilibrium in a Bargaining Model", *Econometrica*, 50, 97-110.
- [7] SOBEL, J. and TAKAHASHI. (1981), "A Multi-Stage Model of Bargaining" (D.P. 80-25*, University of San Diego, California).

Recent titles

CORE Discussion Papers

- 2011/6. Vincent BODART, Bertrand CANDELON and Jean-François CARPANTIER. Real exchanges rates in commodity producing countries: a reappraisal.
- 2011/7. Georg KIRCHSTEIGER, Marco MANTOVANI, Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH. Myopic or farsighted? An experiment on network formation.
- 2011/8. Florian MAYNERIS and Sandra PONCET. Export performance of Chinese domestic firms: the role of foreign export spillovers.
- 2011/9. Hiroshi UNO. Nested potentials and robust equilibria.
- 2011/10. Evgeny ZHELOBODKO, Sergey KOKOVIN, Mathieu PARENTI and Jacques-François THISSE. Monopolistic competition in general equilibrium: beyond the CES.
- 2011/11. Luc BAUWENS, Christian HAFNER and Diane PIERRET. Multivariate volatility modeling of electricity futures.
- 2011/12. Jacques-François THISSE. Geographical economics: a historical perspective.
- 2011/13. Luc BAUWENS, Arnaud DUFAYS and Jeroen V.K. ROMBOUTS. Marginal likelihood for Markov-switching and change-point GARCH models.
- 2011/14. Gilles GRANDJEAN. Risk-sharing networks and farsighted stability.
- 2011/15. Pedro CANTOS-SANCHEZ, Rafael MONER-COLONQUES, José J. SEMPERE-MONERRIS and Oscar ALVAREZ-SANJAIME. Vertical integration and exclusivities in maritime freight transport.
- 2011/16. Géraldine STRACK, Bernard FORTZ, Fouad RIANE and Mathieu VAN VYVE. Comparison of heuristic procedures for an integrated model for production and distribution planning in an environment of shared resources.
- 2011/17. Juan A. MAÑEZ, Rafael MONER-COLONQUES, José J. SEMPERE-MONERRIS and Amparo URBANO Price differentials among brands in retail distribution: product quality and service quality.
- 2011/18. Pierre M. PICARD and Bruno VAN POTTELSBERGHE DE LA POTTERIE. Patent office governance and patent system quality.
- 2011/19. Emmanuelle AURIOL and Pierre M. PICARD. A theory of BOT concession contracts.
- 2011/20. Fred SCHROYEN. Attitudes towards income risk in the presence of quantity constraints.
- 2011/21. Dimitris KOROBILIS. Hierarchical shrinkage priors for dynamic regressions with many predictors.
- 2011/22. Dimitris KOROBILIS. VAR forecasting using Bayesian variable selection.
- 2011/23. Marc FLEURBAEY and Stéphane ZUBER. Inequality aversion and separability in social risk evaluation.
- 2011/24. Helmuth CREMER and Pierre PESTIEAU. Social long term care insurance and redistribution.
- 2011/25. Natali HRITONENKO and Yuri YATSENKO. Sustainable growth and modernization under environmental hazard and adaptation.
- 2011/26. Marc FLEURBAEY and Erik SCHOKKAERT. Equity in health and health care.
- 2011/27. David DE LA CROIX and Axel GOSSERIES. The natalist bias of pollution control.
- 2011/28. Olivier DURAND-LASSERVE, Axel PIERRU and Yves SMEERS. Effects of the uncertainty about global economic recovery on energy transition and CO₂ price.
- 2011/29. Ana MAULEON, Elena MOLIS, Vincent J. VANNETELBOSCH and Wouter VERGOTE. Absolutely stable roommate problems.
- 2011/30. Nicolas GILLIS and François GLINEUR. Accelerated multiplicative updates and hierarchical algorithms for nonnegative matrix factorization.
- 2011/31. Nguyen Thang DAO and Julio DAVILA. Implementing steady state efficiency in overlapping generations economies with environmental externalities.
- 2011/32. Paul BELLEFLAMME, Thomas LAMBERT and Armin SCHWIENBACHER. Crowdfunding: tapping the right crowd.
- 2011/33. Pierre PESTIEAU and Gregory PONTIERE. Optimal fertility along the lifecycle.
- 2011/34. Joachim GAHUNGU and Yves SMEERS. Optimal time to invest when the price processes are geometric Brownian motions. A tentative based on smooth fit.

Recent titles

CORE Discussion Papers - continued

- 2011/35. Joachim GAHUNGU and Yves SMEERS. Sufficient and necessary conditions for perpetual multi-assets exchange options.
- 2011/36. Miguel A.G. BELMONTE, Gary KOOP and Dimitris KOROBILIS. Hierarchical shrinkage in time-varying parameter models.
- 2011/37. Quentin BOTTON, Bernard FORTZ, Luis GOUVEIA and Michael POSS. Benders decomposition for the hop-constrained survivable network design problem.
- 2011/38. J. Peter NEARY and Joe THARAKAN. International trade with endogenous mode of competition in general equilibrium.
- 2011/39. Jean-François CAULIER, Ana MAULEON, Jose J. SEMPERE-MONERRIS and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH. Stable and efficient coalitional networks.
- 2011/40. Pierre M. PICARD and Tim WORRALL. Sustainable migration policies.
- 2011/41. Sébastien VAN BELLEGEM. Locally stationary volatility modelling.
- 2011/42. Dimitri PAOLINI, Pasquale PISTONE, Giuseppe PULINA and Martin ZAGLER. Tax treaties and the allocation of taxing rights with developing countries.
- 2011/43. Marc FLEURBAEY and Erik SCHOKKAERT. Behavioral fair social choice.
- 2011/44. Joachim GAHUNGU and Yves SMEERS. A real options model for electricity capacity expansion.
- 2011/45. Marie-Louise LEROUX and Pierre PESTIEAU. Social security and family support.
- 2011/46. Chiara CANTA. Efficiency, access and the mixed delivery of health care services.
- 2011/47. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ, Salome GVETADZE and Skerdilajda ZANAJ. Migrations, public goods and taxes.
- 2011/48. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ and Joana RESENDE. Credence goods and product differentiation.
- 2011/49. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ, Tanguy VAN YPERSELE and Skerdilajda ZANAJ. Does the seller of a house facing a large number of buyers always decrease its price when its first offer is rejected?

Books

- J. HINDRIKS (ed.) (2008), *Au-delà de Copernic: de la confusion au consensus ?* Brussels, Academic and Scientific Publishers.
- J-M. HURIOT and J-F. THISSE (eds) (2009), *Economics of cities*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- P. BELLEFLAMME and M. PEITZ (eds) (2010), *Industrial organization: markets and strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- M. JUNGER, Th. LIEBLING, D. NADDEF, G. NEMHAUSER, W. PULLEYBLANK, G. REINELT, G. RINALDI and L. WOLSEY (eds) (2010), *50 years of integer programming, 1958-2008: from the early years to the state-of-the-art*. Berlin Springer.
- G. DURANTON, Ph. MARTIN, Th. MAYER and F. MAYNERIS (eds) (2010), *The economics of clusters – Lessons from the French experience*. Oxford University Press.
- J. HINDRIKS and I. VAN DE CLOOT (eds) (2011), *Notre pension en héritage*. Itinera Institute.
- M. FLEURBAEY and F. MANIQUET (eds) (2011), *A theory of fairness and social welfare*. Cambridge University Press.
- V. GINSBURGH and S. WEBER (eds) (2011), *How many languages make sense? The economics of linguistic diversity*. Princeton University Press.

CORE Lecture Series

- D. BIENSTOCK (2001), Potential function methods for approximately solving linear programming problems: theory and practice.
- R. AMIR (2002), Supermodularity and complementarity in economics.
- R. WEISMANTEL (2006), Lectures on mixed nonlinear programming.